Claims 1-5 are pending. Claim 5 has been withdrawn from consideration per the

Restriction Requirement of December 16, 2003.

Applicant's Response to the Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP

64-81874 in view of Reisser et al. (USP 5,332,767). Applicant respectfully traverses on

the basis that JP '874 and Reisser et al. do not provide a prima facia case of obviousness

within the meaning of §103.

The disclosure of the binder of polycarbonate resin and resin/agent coated metal

particle are limitations of claim 1. According to the Office Action, JP '874 discloses a

non-metallic (carbon-black) coated in polyamine polymer and surface treated with

polycarbonate binder. Reisser et al. discloses a resin coated metal particle. The Office

Action maintains that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to take the

resin coated metal of *Reisser et al.* and combine it with the polycarbonate binder of *JP*

'874. The Office's assertion as to motivation for the combination is to "diversify the

aesthetic appearance of the ink." However, Applicant respectfully submits that there is

no such teaching or suggestion in either reference.

As is well established in U.S. patent law, the mere fact that the teachings of the

prior art can be combined does not establish a motivation or suggestion to combine and

make the resultant combination. The prior art must suggest the desirability of the

combination.

is no teaching in JP '874 that diversity of aesthetic appearance would be warranted or

desirable.

As described at pages 2 and 3 of the specification, the invention of this

application provides an ink capable of preventing blurring of images preprinted on the

decorated film or sheets upon injection molding. According to the invention of this

application, the problem of blurring is solved by surface treatment of metal particles used

with the printing ink with a specific resin. The **Reisser et al.** publication (US '767)

shows a metal pigment covered with a synthetic resin, which is provided for the purpose

of improving water resistance, chemical resistance, bind capability, etc., as set forth at

column 2, line 53. JP '874 pertains to an ink sheet dedicated to a thermal transfer printer

that is an impact printer. Neither of the prior publications (which are in distinguishable

technical fields over the invention of this application) describe anything about the

problem to be solved and the means for achieving the same. Thus, the invention of this

application would not have been obvious by combination of the references.

Further, the Applicant notes that the combination of the references would destroy

the intended function of each reference. Hence, one skilled in the art would not have

been motivated to make the combination. Specifically, the resin coating of each

reference is specific to the function of the respective invention. In JP '874, the Abstract

indicates that the carbon black is coated with a polyamine or modified polyamine, and

that these specific polyamines have good compatibility with various solvents, wax and

resins. JP '874 states that the carbon black has a high affinity for the component of ink

ð

binder through the polymer, and consequently the use of the ink gives high quality and

excellent durability.

Consequently, Reisser et al. teaches that the resin coating of the aluminum

pigment has a siloxane coating covalently bonded to the particles and a synthetic resin

bonded to the siloxane coating.

Hence, JP '874 requires a polyamine coating to have utility as an invention and

Reisser et al. requires a siloxane coating to function. JP '874 would not function with a

siloxane resin coating to react properly with the polycarbonate binder. Conversely,

Reisser et al. would not function without the siloxane coating. Wherefore, the references

are not properly combinable because they cannot be combined without destroying their

intended functions.

In regard to claim 2, Applicant notes that none of the references discloses using a

flat metal particle. The Office Action states that flat particles are common in the art.

However, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to utilize flat particles, nor

is there any teaching to suggest a reasonable expectation of success when using the flat

particle.

In regard to claim 3, as stated above, the references require specific resin coating

to function. Wherefore, they teach away from using an acrylic resin coating. Wherefore,

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration.

Claim 4 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 64-

81874 in view of Reisser et al. The arguments above are likewise submitted for the

allowability of claim 4. Claim 4 is drawn to a printed film or sheet. Claim 4 also

includes the limitations of the binder of polycarbonate resin and resin coated metal

U.S. Patent Application Serial No.: 09/803,011

Response dated July 14, 2004

Reply to Office Action of April 14, 2004

particle. Hence, for the reasons submitted in regard to claim 1 above, Applicant requests

favorable reconsideration of claim 4.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that this application is now in

condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that this application is not in

condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants' undersigned

attorney at the telephone number below to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for

an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time

and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No.

50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Bv

Stephen G. Adrian

Reg. No.: 32,878 Attorney for Applicants

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

MJC/SGA/rer